

**CITY COUNCIL/REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION
JOINT MEETING MINUTES**

June 29, 2005

CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Mayor Ives, Council President Nancy McCormick, John Marchione, Tom Paine, John Resha, Pat Vache

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chairperson Snodgrass, Commissioners Allen, McCarthy, Parnell, Querry

STAFF PRESENT: Lori Peckol, Roberta Lewandowski, Rob Odle, Redmond Planning Department

RECORDING SECRETARY: Karen Nolz

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Mayor Ives in the Public Safety Building Council Chambers.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was approved by acclamation.

ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE – None

DISCUSSION TOPICS

Discussion of Overlake Neighborhood Plan Implementation and Refinement

Principal Planner Lori Peckol presented background information on the proposed project, including study area, existing vision for the area, and progress to date in achieving the vision. She explained that staff is interested in hearing the perspective of both City Council and Planning Commission on City and regional interests related to Overlake, perspective on vision for Overlake, and issues to focus on during the project. Planning and Public Works staffs are beginning work on the scope and other project start-up activities. She described the proposed focus of the project, which is to determine what actions are needed to implement the vision and policies for the Overlake area and to begin to prepare for extending Redmond's land use and transportation planning from 2022 to 2030. She stressed the importance of this area to Redmond's housing goals, as Overlake is second only to the downtown as far as the amount of housing planned for this area.

Since this study primarily concerns the commercial part of Overlake, Council President McCormick wondered if this should be called something other than the Overlake Study.

She thinks calling this the Overlake Study would be confusing to people in the Viewpoint area or the residential area north of Overlake.

Ms. Peckol explained that staff is proposing to separate Overlake from Viewpoint, and do the Viewpoint Neighborhood Plan later because of the very different nature of the two neighborhoods.

Commission Chair Snodgrass commented that he is very skeptical that the shopping and mixed use area is going to do anything other than remain largely the same during the next 20 years. Most of the businesses there are mature, established businesses that are possibly nearing the end of their economic life. The idea of trying to tear down a big grocery store to put in a mixed use development is going to take a lot of money and a pretty daring developer. Without a demonstrable market, he would assume that staff is probably thinking primarily of apartments for rent, reasoning that development of apartments would be less expensive than mixed use. He noted that ownership units would be faced with the problems developers currently face with condos. This area is like an island surrounded by other types of uses. He thought the size of the area might be too small to support the kind of uses envisioned in the plan. He expressed skepticism, and thought the vision unrealistic.

Councilmember Marchione wondered if the water and sewer infrastructure is in place for more intense developments to occur in Overlake. He pointed out that with the Microsoft Development Agreement both the surface water and the sewer connections were part of the agreement.

Ms. Peckol assured him that staff plans to look at needs for utility improvements.

Commission Chair Snodgrass commented that staff must have thought about whether or not this is a practical or realistic vision for that area, given what has happened in the last several years.

Ms. Peckol responded that while the proposed study will include an evaluation of whether the vision is feasible, at this point, staff is asking Council members and Commissioners for initial perspectives. Does the group think the vision would be good for the community as a whole and for the region in general? Would it result in a desirable place? Is the vision we have in place the kind of vision they would like to see for the area?

Mayor Ives inquired about what the group thinks about what is there now. She proposed that it would be kind to say this is a major gateway for the City since it is less than attractive, and functions somewhat unsatisfactorily. It lacks attractive architecture, is not pedestrian friendly, and many consider this a tremendous opportunity for change. She continued that she sees this effort to come up with the grand vision that the community would embrace as an opportunity, and noted that determining requirements needed to bring this to reality will be part of the upcoming project.

Council President McCormick recalled that many years ago Bellevue citizens called the area ugly. She said she considers the area a very inhospitable place, although there are a

lot of pedestrians who use the SR 520 overpass. As far as the existing businesses are concerned, at least in the section that was pictured where Safeway is, there have been some recent closures, and there are some empty storefronts. The Overlake area is not safe, not attractive, and the noise and air pollution cannot be good at the intersection of 148th Avenue NE and NE 24th Street, which has one of the highest volumes of traffic in the state.

Council President McCormick stressed that it is incumbent to dare to dream big—to have the grand vision. She thought it imperative that the City of Redmond work with the City of Bellevue to create a shared vision for the area, since the middle of 148th Avenue NE is the dividing line between the two cities. Bellevue is embarking on a planning process for Overlake, so the timing is good to begin some joint exploration. She suggested that a joint Planning Commission meeting between the two cities would be an excellent idea. She proposed that there could be somewhat higher density through redevelopment. There are opportunities for green pocket parks, maybe an urban park. When the first Overlake Plan was adopted, Redmond's Overlake Citizen Action Committee called for an urban park in the Overlake area.

Councilmember Paine commented that envisioning the redevelopment of a commercial area that developed in his lifetime is a challenge for him. There are not many examples on the Eastside of similar redevelopments, but there are some in Seattle that have happened over the last 20 to 30 years. He agreed that at some point a developer could likely look at this vision, and say this could be redeveloped, redevelopment is needed, money could be made on it, and the public is willing to support it.

Commissioner Parnell proposed that a building height of five stories in this particular area is a limit that should be reconsidered. As he told a friend considering a real estate investment in Redmond, Overlake is a really great place because there is the ability to put in underground parking that cannot be done in downtown Redmond due to the water table. He conjectured that eventually there might be a bridge over the middle of Lake Sammamish that would run right through Overlake on NE 24th Street. He noted the current concentration of jobs in Overlake and his certainty that Microsoft would be around there in large concentration for at least the next 20 years. Depending on the planning, he thought that for-rent housing might not be the only thing that develops. He could see some mid-rise development with great views out both Lake Sammamish and Lake Washington that could be really valuable property, especially close to high-wage jobs. So over the next 100 years, Overlake is likely to develop more intensely than downtown Redmond with all this considered, as well as the fact that this area is a promontory with one of the best views on the Eastside.

Mayor Ives noted that the top floor of the Villages at Overlake development has the best views of Seattle in that area.

Commissioner Allen reported that in the previous Friday's *Seattle Times* there was an article about a national study on retail and demand. The Seattle area placed very high with retail vacancy rates being quite low. Town Center was one of the focuses of the article, and was reported to be turning down mid- to large-size retailers for lack of space. If the

demand is this high, Overlake should be designed to provide that space. She cited Juanita Village as being unique. She proposed that if Town Center is running such a low vacancy rate in this area with its proximity to Microsoft, the City should be able to provide incentives for the proper development in Overlake, which does need to be mixed use to integrate the housing and commercial there.

Commission Chair Snodgrass assured the group that his skepticism does not mean he does not believe in the area, and he does think that something needs to be done. He said he would like to know how much of the City's housing goal is planned for that area. Significant housing development may not be feasible by 2022 but would be possible in an outstretched horizon. If we are counting on a fairly significant amount of housing in the Overlake Center by 2022, then some other areas in the City must be considered.

Councilmember Resha commented that he tends to agree with Commissioner Parnell that the currently allowed building heights may be too limiting given the economics of the area. Perhaps the way to encourage redevelopment is to provide opportunities for greater return on investment. There could be constraints by the current challenges with the insurance market and condo liability, but he thinks that will be resolved at the state level by the time that developers realize there is a market in Overlake for something different.

He conjectured that the biggest challenge would be mobility because of the existing employment density in Overlake, and because he believes there is not enough money to support two high-capacity transit stations in the Overlake area. A choice will have to be made, which means we are probably going to be right at the edge of making redevelopment in Overlake feasible. Since we are really talking about a full urban village concept, we may have to be a little flexible so this entire area has the pedestrian features needed to improve connectivity. He continued that relying on high-capacity transit to be Redmond's sole form of transit in this area is the wrong idea. Having key areas in Overlake and in the Downtown as major stops and then having better feeder services might be the right approach. He said he thought Redmond has the market and opportunity to develop that over time, but those things have to be considered as we design the system.

Commission Chair Snodgrass questioned whether high-capacity transit is needed for the Overlake retail area.

Councilmember Resha responded that concurrency requirements will stop redevelopment until there is enough capacity in the system, and the only way to avoid that is through high-capacity transit.

Commission Chair Snodgrass suggested looking at the housing goal of 1,500 housing units in this area through 2012 and assuming that would be the eventual build out. He said he assumes most of the residents of this housing would be Microsoft or Nintendo employees who would not be going to work in Seattle or downtown Redmond. He questioned why spend millions of dollars to provide what might not be a necessary transit service to this area? It seems redundant to him.

Councilmember Resha commented that what Commission Chair Snodgrass and he are talking about is not dissimilar. Both are talking about having one major connection in this area with other types of service feeding from it. He contended that Redmond is going to have transportation challenges, and that he sees high-capacity transit as a major component of Redmond's overall mobility. Redmond has many transportation needs. He does not see the housing proposed for the Overlake area as Microsoft housing, and does not want housing built with that as a goal. He noted that not everyone who works at Microsoft lives in Redmond, and vice versa.

Mayor Ives noted that the Safeco campus has 400,000 additional square feet that can be developed, and that possibly the next occupant of the campus could be a university. This would create demand for high-capacity transit on the edge of the Overlake retail area, and might create the need for a station to be north of 40th. She emphasized that there are some who feel very strongly that high-capacity transit in that corridor needs to be part of Redmond's future.

Commission Chair Snodgrass agreed, and said he is not talking about the corridor at all. He disagreed that high-capacity transit is necessary to the retail area, but certainly is necessary for the corridor and employment areas.

Mayor Ives noted that CamWest, an active developer in Redmond, has a very attractive, three-story building right next to Juanita Village. She thought the Safeway area could redevelop to three or four stories, which would be very acceptable if done well and made of materials that can stand the test of time. Going up the slope, five- to six-story buildings might be acceptable. She recommended that some work be done on the design standards to ensure new buildings are designed to provide architectural interest and durability over time.

Council President McCormick said she shares the Mayor's thoughts on Juanita Village. The slides of buildings in Madison Park had much more character. There could be density, yet adherence to the design standards.

Mayor Ives pointed out that in places such as the Boston Back Bay area the building heights in the various in-city neighborhoods do not exceed four stories. She does not want Redmond to buy into 6- to 10-story buildings. She encouraged thinking about how heights of 6 to 10 stories feel for people living in and visiting the neighborhood. How it looks and feels is very important, as are the materials that are used. She thinks this is important work, and should be undertaken with the involvement of the community as well as the Design Review Board.

Commissioner Parnell agreed that the Boston Back Bay area is wonderful, but does have some highly desirable, elegant 10- to 15-story buildings set on the edge of parks, with hanging gardens flowing from their roofs, that are in nice neighborhoods, and form a perimeter and a defining feature in the landscape.

Commissioner McCarthy commented that one of the challenges is to make people think of Overlake as part of Redmond, since Overlake has grown up along an arbitrary dividing line.

It will also be a challenge to keep this area economically viable during redevelopment. Long-term questions are: How do we make sure we encourage redevelopment without forcing out some of the businesses that we depend on? How do we keep some of the tax revenue right here? Should this be done through design standards or incentives, such as building height or adjustments in parking requirements? This area should be turned into an attractive gateway to Redmond. To entice developers is going to take close cooperation with Bellevue to avoid ending up with one big unattractive area split down the middle into two smaller equally unattractive and conflicting areas.

Commission Chair Snodgrass suggested looking at a BROTS-type approach for coordination between the two cities.

Mayor Ives responded that this has been considered. Bellevue's city manager and she have talked, as have their respective staffs in Planning and Public Works, and a BROTS-type of approach is in the offing.

Councilmember Paine suggested that there be an approach where there would be a formal agreement on both sides.

Regarding City and regional interests, Council President McCormick commented that as the Planning Commission goes through this work, she would hope they would consider opportunities to provide incentives. One of the Council's objectives concerns encouraging a pilot or demonstration project for the commercial area of Overlake, with the opportunity to work jointly and regionally with Bellevue. Overlake has always been Redmond's primary tax base, and she believes this is currently so.

Mayor Ives suggested that there probably needs to be some research done before the City offers incentives, such as evaluating potential interest and plans.

Councilmember Resha thought Mayor Ives might be taking incentives too literally. He proposed that incentives could be as broad as density, more units, or more flexibility, and should not be confined to cash and financial incentives because financial incentives can come in different ways.

Commissioner Allen reminded the joint group that they had originally discussed getting some feedback from the development community to find out what it would take and why it is not happening, so the kind of incentives—both cash and non-cash—the development community might require to make this vision happen will be known.

Councilmember Marchione suggested that they start small and think big on the density. Bellevue has an interest in keeping its center north. He thought that though Redmond and Bellevue look at this area differently, there are opportunities for Redmond to identify proposals that can also be consistent with Bellevue's interest rather than in conflict.

Councilmember Resha noted that according to a survey taken about a year ago, about 40 to 50% of the people who work for Microsoft come from North Seattle. Redmond's employment coming from the south is 18.5%, though that is still a significant population.

Councilmember Marchione stated that there are people who come from the University of Washington and some who come from Seattle. He thought it might not be in Seattle's best interests if there were a direct link to Redmond going through Bellevue, but going straight down SR 520 might be a Seattle interest that would help Redmond toward its goals.

Councilmember Cole said he has difficulties with the vision for Overlake.

Commissioner Query commented that she has mixed views on the concept of taller buildings, because while allowing greater building heights could provide some incentive for developers, no one wants shady, windy corridors. Downtown Redmond gets close enough to that with some of the larger buildings clustered together. She considers this a disincentive to pedestrian traffic, and has concerns around that.

Mayor Ives considered looking at the issue of potential shadows due to tall buildings as very important, and also designing new development in a manner that blends well with its surroundings.

Councilmember Marchione queried, what if the City built needed sewer and water improvements in Overlake, and charged latecomers fees as an incentive. Maybe that concept could apply if we want development to come sooner rather than later.

With regard to questions to address during the study, Councilmember Vache suggested: What City actions are discouraging redevelopment in Overlake?

Commissioner McCarthy added: To what extent might actions by the City of Bellevue influence this area regardless of what Redmond does?

On the issue of mobility, Mayor Ives suggested taking a look at 148th Avenue NE, NE 24th Street, NE 20th Street, and Bel-Red Road, and thinking about what would be required for these corridors to have a different feel and function. For example, what about adding more streets to the grid to break up some of the big blocks, and provide more options for how people move through the area?

Councilmember Resha added that the transportation system is critical to Redmond and the region. He agreed that we need to ensure we are open to various possibilities.

Commissioner Allen admitted she is having trouble with the vision, and a stumbling block is not knowing Redmond's preferred alignment for the high-capacity transit system. She stressed the need to nail down the preferred alignment.

Commission Chair Snodgrass questioned if the timing of Redmond's study is premature.

Ms. Peckol responded that Sound Transit is just getting ready to begin Phase 2 within another month or so, so staff is closely coordinating with that in order to position well. The City will be able to provide input with respect to alignment and potential stationeries.

Commission Chair Snodgrass asked if it would make sense to do that first, and then work on the Overlake Plan.

Ms. Peckol replied that staff is taking this into account by matching the work with Sound Transit's schedule.

Commissioner Allen inquired if the alignment options would come before the Planning Commission.

Ms. Peckol said she would get back to her with regard to how detailed the City needs to be at this stage.

Mayor Ives clarified that there would be a public process for the high-capacity transit alignment through Redmond.

Commissioner Querry added two questions to the list: Has any environmental degradation occurred over the years due to the shopping center? Are there opportunities for environmental enhancement as we look to redevelop the area, such as opportunities for daylighting streams?

Council President McCormick explained that there used to be deer on the Sears site, but as far as any streams are concerned, she does not think so. In response to the question raised as to whether or not to have a citizens' action committee, a focus group of businesses makes more sense to her because the subject is that portion of Overlake. But she cautioned not to forget to involve the citizens in some fashion. At some point, a community meeting to get the input of citizens, although not necessarily a CAC, would be valuable.

Ms. Peckol acknowledged that staff definitely plans to do that in a variety of ways.

Councilmember Vache questioned if it would be worthwhile to put any time into looking at the infrastructure, such as the water, sewer capabilities, capacity, and the long-term requirements of those.

Ms. Peckol answered that this would be very important, and would be addressed.

Proposed Implementation Actions and Community Indicators Program

Ms. Peckol provided an introduction for the study session, beginning with a recap of the community goals that provide the basis for the Comprehensive Plan and the proposed implementation program. She briefly described the relationship between the Comprehensive Plan, the implementation actions (steps needed to carry out the Plan), and the community indicators (measures for evaluating progress toward community goals). She also highlighted staff's responses to date to Council direction and questions.

Councilmember Cole thanked staff for making a number of changes to items that had bothered him. He admitted that he is struggling with the entire issue, and questioned growing city government at a time when the money is not there. He thinks the City should be doing less, not more. He does not think the City can afford to keep expanding, because the revenue is not there. He considered some of the items on the actions list not to have much value.

Councilmember Resha commented that he likes the proposed program in concept, and noted that there is a great deal of information there. But he is still struggling with why. He continued that there are a number of wonderful data points grouped with the goals, but he could not tell why these make a difference. There is so much data that fits in each group. Does it really tell us if the City is succeeding at this goal, or having challenges with this goal, or is it just a data point? Data for the sake of data is not worth it. He is still having trouble figuring how to use these data points, and understand how they are giving value.

Commissioner McCarthy said he shared Councilmember Resha's thoughts initially, and probably still shares them, but has come to a rationalization. As a city, we gather a lot of data. He views recognizing this as the first step. By formalizing an implementation and indicators program, the information gathered can be reviewed periodically to determine: Do we really need this? Is there still a value to collecting this? If there is a value, hopefully we can quantify it, and say that it is worth it. If not, we can say we do not need this any more.

Commissioner Allen commented that having just come through the Comprehensive Plan amendment process, and as a new commissioner and a relatively new citizen, it is helpful to think through the process from the macro level of vision, narrowing to goals, and finally to the policies. But the average citizen wants to know, what are we achieving? How does it relate to how our government is working? As we reviewed the policies, we asked staff if we are actually carrying out these policies. As a planning commissioner, it seems it will be very helpful to be able to have a data check to determine that a policy is being carried out and is effective. We are actually implementing it in this way, or we have not implemented it at all. Do we still need it? To have these concrete indicators is very helpful for citizens to know that their government is in check with the policies, and it will be helpful to Commissioners to know as well.

Council President McCormick agreed that there certainly are a number of data points, and it could be used just for that purpose. But she sees the potential for the program being far more. She said that none of them would probably disagree that citizens in Washington and throughout the United States have grown cynical of government. It seems to her that this has the potential to provide the same kind of benefit as the proposed report cards to citizens for the Transportation Master Plan that will help explain and show citizens the value they are getting for their tax dollars. There are many activities in which the City engages of which John and Jane Q. Public have little or no knowledge, so the proposed program would likely contribute to a more informed, and probably more active and involved, citizenry. That is always a worthy goal. This could help the budget process as we look at different

activities within programs in trying to quantify and figure out what we are going to be able to do in the future. She reminded them of the gloomy forecast for the City's long-term future that they heard the previous evening. She said she sees this as a positive document.

Mayor Ives responded that it is only a gloomy future if we allow it to be. She considered there to be lots of opportunities.

Councilmember Paine commented that the term measuring outcomes means something to him, and he was having difficulty understanding why Councilmembers are objecting to having data available to track progress.

Councilmember Vache added that he could not figure out why anyone would not want to have data available to measure performance. The easiest way to create big government is never measure what the government is doing, or never compare policies to activities, or never ask if anything is being accomplished. He remembered that Redmond used to be semi-rural, and Redmond's very first policy states "conserve agricultural lands." Data is necessary to know if this is being accomplished.

Councilmember Resha commented that he loves data, but what does the data tell us?

Councilmember Paine offered that the data tells Councilmembers what questions to ask.

Commissioner Query explained that she has made her living collecting data for private industries. She has learned that data does not equal information. What is incumbent upon us as we collect this is to make certain that we get action points for anything we are measuring, and consistently ask ourselves: What are we going to do differently because of what we have just learned? Then it is very valuable, is not adding to the bureaucracy, makes the report card very meaningful, and enables putting in the remediation plan to get from our D to our A.

Councilmember Paine added that it helps ensure that ongoing efforts focus on where they are needed and what the policy makers said needed to happen.

Mayor Ives commented that those in leadership roles have the responsibility of thinking for ourselves about what this information tells us, and whether or not we think individually or collectively that it advances the vision that we say we honor and serve.

Commissioner Parnell told of an example he experienced when he worked at an oil refinery in corrosion control. They took data from disparate sources, and threw in a few false positives about pipes that had been corroding through. Not only did the software find the three false positives, but also found a fourth area of concern that was about to explode. He considers it very interesting what can be done with data. The patterns of the information you are able to see in a digest view are probably more valuable than the raw data itself.

Commission Chair Snodgrass said that the only thing he sees missing is what to do with the data. He added that he probably should have thought of this when they were actually

reviewing the proposed program. A reporting frequency is included, but not to whom it is reported, or what the form of the report is.

Ms. Peckol said that looking at the second page of Attachment B, there is a description that the City will use these reports to provide information to the public and City officials about actions to implement the plan. We will use the reports to determine what kinds of actions we need to take in order to more effectively carry out our goals and policies. She inquired if the wording should be more specific that these reports will go to City Council, the Planning Commission, other City officials, and the community.

Commission Chair Snodgrass added that one of the best ways to make government serve is to build in some requirements as to what that service is.

Ms. Peckol confirmed that staff would make this wording more specific.

Referring to the last paragraph on page 2, Commissioner Querry pointed out that there is a statement that the City will make changes to the indicators and adjustments for data that may be missing, but there is nothing said about the process for that.

Ms. Peckol explained that the second paragraph speaks to that, but maybe not explicitly enough, so staff would make that more clear.

Councilmember Marchione posed a question of whether there should be a link between funding and the indicators. To measure success, effort toward that success must be measured, and the budget is one way to make these indicators more meaningful. He did not consider all 80 of these indicators useful, but there are some that speak to the character of our community and what we want it to be.

Mayor Ives answered that she would take that under consideration. She stressed that the City does a lot of important work. One place where the City has been remiss is not spending time and resources to tell the story. She commented that there are, however, topics on the list, such as education, that the City does not have responsibility for, and commented that it would be helpful to note those indicators which primarily concern organizations outside of the City.

Council President McCormick reminded the City Council that there would be a study session on this topic later in July in which there would be more detail in the discussion.

Councilmember Marchione explained that our overall goal in public safety is protecting people and property, so those are the outcomes to measure, as opposed to number of officers per 1,000 citizens. One measurement for the Fire Department might be: the fire does not spread beyond one room. There are a number of ways to accomplish that. Or it might be that there is a fire station on every corner or a sprinkler in every house. There are six or eight ways that are not just tied to one person or one action to accomplish that goal. That is what we need in our outcomes, something broad enough, but concrete enough to measure.

Councilmember Paine commented that some of this information might lay dormant until needed. He mentioned the chapter in the book “Freakonomics” in which the author was trying to understand why the crime rate in a city declined dramatically over the last 20 years. One of the things he talked about was the more policemen a city has, the lower the crime rate. Councilmember Paine was not sure how to put dollars on crime, but noted that when running a city a lot of value cannot be measured in dollars.

Councilmember Marchione added that a level of effort can be measured.

Councilmember Paine continued that there are a lot of things that are hard to measure, but the book—and particularly the chapter on crime—used a great deal of data to try and understand why the crime rate went down. The reason was not just policemen per thousand; it was a whole combination of things. But he had to have the data available to study and write the book; and, in our case, to be able to resolve issues and determine best courses of action. The author’s contention is the more policemen there are, the more criminals measure risk.

Councilmember Vache commented that there is a column missing from this table—*trends*. Before you start measuring, you start defining. What does it mean if something starts going up, down, or stays the same?

Ms. Peckol agreed to add a column, “What is desired trend line (up or down)?”

Council President McCormick noted that in the priorities listed on page 21, Attachment B, the Eastside Economic Development Committee is listed as 2-5 years out for the start. In her opinion, that is the one out of all these that should start sooner. This is even more confirmed by Redmond’s sales tax data in comparison to other cities’ sales tax data heard the previous evening.

Mayor Ives complimented the report as very comprehensive. She was impressed with the thought and work staff put into this. Ultimately, the question is: What is the trend, and is it taking us in the direction that people in Redmond want?

Commission Chair Snodgrass explained that the Planning Commission is going to keep working at how to make public access to this information more readily available. It is a quality of life issue as far as the Commission is concerned, and comes up in virtually every topic they discuss.

Ms. Peckol clarified that this is a list of the proposed indicators and their reporting frequencies, and not what the reports would look like. Staff did attach an example of what King County’s reports look like. There would definitely be descriptions that go along with the context and what actions are suggested from this.

Other Topics As Desired

Council President McCormick commented that traditionally, when there is a joint Planning Commission/City Council meeting, discussion topics are what success looks like and what has gone well and not as well. The Council recognizes and appreciates that the Planning Commission has done a lot of hard work. She continued that perhaps something that did not work quite as well was the parallel review track for the Transportation Master Plan, and that view is probably jointly shared by both groups. On behalf of the Council, she thanked the Planning Commissioners' work on many major issues.

ADJOURN

Mayor Ives adjourned the meeting at 9:02 p.m.

Minutes Approved On:

Recording Secretary
